

NIAD 213.1 (10103726)

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 have been amended. Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice and replaced with claim 12. Thus, claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12 are pending. Applicants now believe this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that substance (i) and aminoguanidine in claim 5 could be the same compound, thereby leading to confusion concerning the method. The Examiner also argued that the relationship between the two measurements in claims 5 and 7 was unclear.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to indicate that the substance to be tested is *not* aminoguanidine. As such, any confusion that may have been caused by claim 5 has been eliminated. The amendment to claim 1 also clarifies the relationship between the measurements performed. Claim 7 has been cancelled and rewritten in independent form as new claim 12. Claim 12 also clearly defines the relationship between the two measurements that are taken. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cervantes-Laurean et al. (IDS). The Examiner argues that this paper discloses a method of admixing ADP-ribose and histone H1 and measuring glycation. The invention here is *not* a method of measuring glycation. Rather, it is the comparison between the assays, which is used determine if a substance regulates glycation of a protein. As discussed supra, claim 1 has been amended and clarifies this point. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

NIAD 213.1 (10103726)

With regard to the functional language in claim 9, Applicants point out that claim 1 has been amended to recite that the substance to be tested is not aminoguanidine. Since claim 9 depends from claim 1, it follows that the nucleophilic compound cannot be aminoguanidine.

All rejections have been addressed and overcome. Allowance of this application is believed proper and is urged.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.



Norman D. Hanson, Esq.  
Registration No. 30,946